

From wang!elf.wang.com!ucsd.edu!packet-radio-relay Sat Mar 2 15:10:19 1991 remote
from tosspot
Received: by tosspot (1.63/waf)
via UUCP; Sat, 02 Mar 91 21:38:14 EST
for lee
Received: from somewhere by elf.wang.com id aa04699; Sat, 2 Mar 91 15:10:18 GMT
Received: from ucsd.edu by news.UU.NET with SMTP
(5.61/UUNET-shadow-mx) id AA19989; Sat, 2 Mar 91 08:47:20 -0500
Received: by ucsd.edu; id AA00779
sendmail 5.64/UCSD-2.1-sun
Sat, 2 Mar 91 04:30:13 -0800 for hpbbrd!db0sao!dg4scv
Received: by ucsd.edu; id AA00773
sendmail 5.64/UCSD-2.1-sun
Sat, 2 Mar 91 04:30:12 -0800 for /usr/lib/sendmail -oc -odb -oQ/var/spool/
lqueue -oi -fpacket-radio-relay packet-radio-list
Message-Id: <9103021230.AA00773@ucsd.edu>
Date: Sat, 2 Mar 91 04:30:08 PST
From: Packet-Radio Mailing List and Newsgroup </dev/null@ucsd.edu>
Reply-To: Packet-Radio@ucsd.edu
Subject: Packet-Radio Digest V91 #57
To: packet-radio@ucsd.edu

Packet-Radio Digest Sat, 2 Mar 91 Volume 91 : Issue 57

Today's Topics:

Grapes/PI card wanted
HF Packet A Silly Idea

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Packet-Radio@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Packet-Radio-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Packet-Radio Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/packet-radio".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Fri, 1 Mar 91 08:42:09 EST
From: barry@dgbt.doc.ca (Barry McLarnon)
Subject: Grapes/PI card wanted
To: packet-radio@ucsd.edu

The GRAPES WA4DSY 56kbps modem and the Ottawa PI card are separate items,
from separate groups. All inquiries about the PI card should go to me:

barry@dgbt.doc.ca

The contact for info on the modem is Doug Drye, KD4NC:

...gatech!emory!kd4nc!dug

Barry VE3JF

Barry McLarnon		Internet: barry@dgbt.doc.ca
Communications Research Centre		PBBS: VE3JF@VE3JF.ON.CAN
Ottawa, Canada K2H 8S2		AMPRnet: barry@hs.ve3jf [44.135.96.7]

Date: Fri, 1 Mar 91 09:08 EDT
From: <DOANE%CTSTATEU.BITNET@YALEVM.YCC.Yale.Edu>
Subject: HF Packet A Silly Idea
To: Packet-Radio@UCSD.EDU

Original Article:

True. Of course, at 300 bps, transmission time is less, so some types of fading and QRM might be less likely to affect Packet. I agree that AMTOR might be more resilient to poor path conditions, though. You make a good point.

--
James L. Paul

***** Reply:

You bet Amtor is more resilient! I have seen stuff go through even when you can hardly hear the station! It's a super mode!
--Betsey Doane, K1EIC

End of Packet-Radio Digest
